



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/714,802

11/17/2003

Robert A. Cordery

F-650

2960

7590

06/24/2008

Pitney Bowes Inc.
Intellectual Property & Technology Law Department
35 Waterview Drive
P.O. Box 3000
Shelton, CT 06484

EXAMINER

PRESTON, JOHN O

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3691

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/24/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/714,802	Applicant(s) CORDERY ET AL.	
	Examiner JOHN O. PRESTON	Art Unit 3691	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on March 20, 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-19 and 21-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-19, and 21-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-4, 6-19, and 21-28 are presented for examination. Applicant filed an amendment on March 20, 2008. Claims 5 and 20 have been canceled. Claims 1-3, 6-10, 12-15, 17, 18 and 21-25 have been amended. Since the new grounds of rejection were necessitated by applicant's amendment of the claim(s), the rejection of claims 1-4, 6-19, and 21-28 is a final rejection of the claim(s).

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed March 20, 2008 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

Art Unit: 3691

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9, 10, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Funk (6,059,185) and in view of Borgendale (5,734,568).

Claim 1: With regard to the limitations of:

- *reading information from a check of the plurality of checks, the check being drawn against an account maintained by a customer at a financial institution*, Funk, in at least column 3, lines 48-50 discloses a reader that reads checking account information from a check.
- *sorting the check based on the sort order priority number obtained from the database*, Funk, in at least column 1, lines 45-50 discloses checks being sorted by bank or other designation according to transit and routing information.
- *repeating the reading, obtaining and sorting steps for each of the plurality of checks*, Funk, in at least column 1, lines 10-60 discloses a check processing procedure that involves multiple repetitive steps including reading, obtaining, and sorting.

However, Funk does not disclose the remaining limitations alone. In regard to the following limitation:

- *using at least a portion of the information read from the check, obtaining a sort priority order number for the check from a database, the sort priority order number being based on a delivery location specified by the customer for an account statement associated with the account;*

Funk, in at least column 3, line 60 to column 4, line 7 discloses a document identification number (DIN) located in the DIN database that is automatically generated for each processed check and may be

composed of a combination of all or some of the data read from the check. In addition, Borgendale, in at least col. 1, lines 24-38 and col. 2, lines 50-65, teaches a system wherein an alphanumeric string is provided representing the city, state, and/or zip code for the intended destination of the mail piece.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the check sorting method cited in Funk with the technique as taught by Borgendale because the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately.

Claim 2: Funk/Borgendale discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of Claim 1 above. With regard to the limitation of *reading a routing number associated with the financial institution from the check*, Funk, in at least column 3, lines 45-55 discloses a reader that reads routing information on the check.

Claim 3: Funk/Borgendale discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of Claim 1 above. With regard to the limitation of *reading a number of the account upon which the check is drawn from the check*, Funk, in at least column 3, lines 50-55 discloses a checking account number being read from a check.

Claim 4: Funk/Borgendale discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of Claim 1 above. With regard to the limitation of *reading a check number from the check*, Funk, in at least column 3, lines 50-55 discloses a check number being read from a check.

Claim 6: Funk/Borgendale discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of Claim 1 above. With regard to the limitation of *the sort priority order number is further based on a type of account associated with the check*, Funk, in at least column 4, lines 1-10 discloses a document identification

number that may be composed of a combination of all or some of the transaction data. Transaction data may include the type of account associated with the check.

Claim 7: Funk/Borgendale discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of Claim 1 above. With regard to the limitation of *the sort priority order number is further based on processing for the check specified by the customer*, Funk, in at least column 4, lines 1-10 discloses a document identification number that may be composed of a document sequence number.

Claim 9: Funk/Borgendale discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of Claim 1 above. With regard to the limitation of *wherein the sort priority order number is further based on an amount of the check*, Funk, in at least column 4, lines 1-10 discloses a document identification number that may be composed of a combination of all or some of the transaction data. Transaction data may include the amount of the check.

Claim 10: Funk/Borgendale discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of Claim 1 above. With regard to the limitation of *wherein the sort priority order number is further based on a payee of the check*, Funk, in at least column 4, lines 1-10 discloses a document identification number that may be composed of a combination of all or some of the transaction data. Transaction data may include a payee of the check.

Claim 13: Funk/Borgendale discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of Claim 1 above. With regard to the limitation of *using at least a portion of the information read from the check as a pointer to obtain the sort priority order number for the check from the database*, Funk further discloses in at least column 3, line 60 to column 4, line 5 a document identification number that may be comprised of information read from the check.

Art Unit: 3691

5. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Funk/Borgendale and in view of Behera (5,287,497).

Claim 8: Funk/Borgendale discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of Claim 7 above. However, Funk/Borgendale does not explicitly disclose the remaining limitation(s). With regard to the limitation of *wherein processing for the check includes whether or not the check will be included with the account statement associated with the account*, Behera, in at least col. 2, lines 7-15, teaches a system wherein check images are printed on the statement. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the check sorting method cited in Funk/Borgendale with the technique as taught by Behera because the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately.

6. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Funk/Borgendale as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Holm (3,949,363).

Claim 11: Funk/Borgendale discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of Claim 1 above. Funk/Borgendale does not explicitly disclose the following limitations, but Holm, as shown, does:

- *placing the plurality of checks in a feeder* (See at least Holm: column 2, lines 53-55: a document feeder where checks are placed).
- *separating the check from the plurality of checks* (See at least Holm: column 2, lines 55-63: checks are moved serially in an uninterrupted line).

- *scanning the check to read the information* (See at least Holm: column 2, lines 55-58: checks are moved through a read module).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the check sorting method of Funk/Borgendale with the scanning technique of Holm because it greatly reduces the error rate and increases the efficiency involved with reading information from checks when they are placed in a feeder and scanned individually (See at least Holm: column 1, line 54 – column 2, line 25).

7. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Funk/Borgendale as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Cahill (6,574,377).

Claim 12: Funk/Borgendale discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of Claim 1 above. Funk/Borgendale does not explicitly disclose the limitation of *placing the check in an appropriate bin based on the sort order priority number*. However, Cahill, in at least Column 14, Lines 8-11, discloses checks being sorted based on information read from the check and deposited into pockets. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the check sorting method of Funk/Borgendale with the sort technique of Cahill because it creates a more efficient method of handling the checks (See at least Cahill: column 5, lines 4-13).

8. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Funk/Borgendale as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Green (5,602,936).

Claim 14: Funk/Borgendale discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of Claim 1 above. Funk/Borgendale does not explicitly disclose the

limitation of *wherein the plurality of checks include separators*. However, Green, in at least Column 10, Lines 43-60, discloses the use of separators with sorted checks. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the sorting method of Funk/Borgendale with the use of separators by Green because the use of separators makes the sorting process cheaper and more efficient (See at least Green: column 1, line 53 – column 2, line 20).

9. Claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cahill et al (6,574,377), and in view of Borgendale and further in view of De Leo (US 6,576,857 B1).

Claim 15: With regard to the limitations of:

- *a scanner module to read information from a check, (see Cahill, Fig. 3, Items 204, 205, and 206).*
- *a controller coupled to the scanner, the controller receiving the information read from the check by the scanner, (see Cahill, Fig. 3, Item 201)*
- *the controller obtaining the sort priority order number for the check from the database using at least a portion of the information read from the check, (see Cahill, Fig. 3, Item 201).*
- *a sorter coupled to the controller (see Cahill Fig. 3, Item 200),*
- *the sorter receiving the check from the scanner and placing the check into one of a plurality of bins based on the sort order priority number obtained from the database, Cahill, in at least column 12, lines 50-54 discloses a sorter that sorts checks to one of a plurality of pockets. Cahill, in at least column 18,*

lines 18-25, further discloses checks being sorted by the sorter based on the information read from the check.

However, Cahill does not explicitly disclose the remaining limitations alone. In regard to the following limitation:

- *a database coupled to the controller, the database storing sort priority order numbers for the plurality of checks, the sort priority order number for each check being based on a delivery location specified by the respective customer for an account statement associated with the account maintained by the respective customer*

Cahill, in Fig. 3, Item 202, discloses a database coupled to a controller, the database storing data pertaining to a plurality of checks. In addition, Borgendale, in at least column 1 lines 24-38, teaches a system wherein a mailing address is scanned and converting into an alphanumeric string. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the system cited in Cahill with the mailing technique as taught by Borgendale because the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately. Also, see at least De Leo, col. 1, lines 39-50, wherein De Leo teaches a system that performs a series of sort cycles based on criteria provided by the user. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the system cited in Cahill with the sorting technique as taught by De Leo because the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately.

Claim 16: Cahill/Borgendale/De Leo discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of Claim 15 above. With regard to the limitation of *wherein the*

Art Unit: 3691

controller is integral with the sorter, Cahill, in at least column 12, lines 45-55, further discloses a sort station that includes a sorting machine and a controller.

10. Claims 17-22, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cahill/Borgendale/De Leo as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Funk.

Claim 17: Cahill/Borgendale/De Leo discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of Claim 15 above. Cahill/Borgendale/De Leo does not disclose the limitation of *wherein the information read from the check includes a routing number*. However, Funk, in at least Column 3, Lines 50-55, discloses routing information being read from a check. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the check sorting method of Cahill/Borgendale/De Leo with the use of routing information by Funk because using routing information found on a check is an efficient and cost-effective means of processing checks (See at least Funk: column 2, lines 24-35).

Claim 18: Cahill/Borgendale/De Leo discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of Claim 15 above. Cahill/Borgendale/De Leo does not disclose the limitation of *wherein the information read from the check includes an account number*. However, Funk, in at least Column 3, Lines 50-56, discloses a checking account number being read from a check. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method of Cahill/Borgendale/De Leo with the technique of Funk because using checking account numbers to process checks is an efficient method for tracking checks (See at least Funk: column 2, lines 24-35).

Claim 19: Cahill/Borgendale/De Leo discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of Claim 15 above. Cahill/Borgendale/De Leo does not disclose

Art Unit: 3691

the limitation of *wherein the information read from the check includes a check number*. However, Funk, in at least Column 1, Lines 40-50, discloses a check number being included as the information read from a check. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the check sorting method of Cahill/Borgendale/De Leo with the use of check numbers by Funk because the use of check numbers to process checks is an efficient method for tracking checks (See at least Funk: column 2, lines 24-35).

Claim 21: Cahill/Borgendale/De Leo discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of Claim 15 above. Cahill/Borgendale/De Leo does not disclose the limitation of *wherein the sort order priority number is based on a type of account associated with the check*. However, Funk, in at least Column 3, Lines 65-67 and Column 4, Lines 1-7 discloses a document identification number that may be composed of a combination of all or some of the transaction data. The type of account associated with a check qualifies as transaction data. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the check sorting method of Cahill/Borgendale/De Leo with the classification technique of Funk because classifying checks based on the type of account associated with the check improves the utility and efficiency of the accounting process (See at least Funk: column 2, lines 24-35).

Claim 22: Cahill/Borgendale/De Leo discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of Claim 15 above. Cahill/Borgendale/De Leo does not disclose the limitation of *wherein the sort order priority number is based on processing of the check*. However, Funk, in at least Column 3, Lines 60-67 and Column 4, Lines 1-7 discloses a document identification number that may be based on a document sequence number. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

Art Unit: 3691

to combine the check sorting method of Cahill/Borgendale/De Leo with the classification technique of Funk because using a classification system that is based on the processing of the check itself is an efficient method for tracking checks (See at least Funk: column 2, lines 24-35).

Claim 24: Cahill/Borgendale/De Leo discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of Claim 15 above. Cahill/Borgendale/De Leo does not disclose the limitation of *wherein the sort order priority number is based on an amount of the check*. However, Funk, in at least Column 3, Lines 58-76 and Column 4, Lines 1-10, discloses a document identification number that may be composed of a combination of all or some of the transaction data. The amount of a check qualifies as transaction data. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the check sorting method of Cahill/Borgendale/De Leo with the classification technique of Funk because processing checks based on the check amount is an efficient method for tracking checks (See at least Funk: column 2, lines 24-35).

Claim 25: Cahill/Borgendale/De Leo discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of Claim 15 above. Cahill/Borgendale/De Leo does not disclose the limitation of *wherein the sort order priority number is based on a payee of the check*. However, Funk, in at least Column 3, Lines 63-67 and Column 4, Lines 1-7 discloses a document identification number that may be composed of a combination of all or some of the transaction data. The payee of the check qualifies as transaction data. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the check sorting method of Cahill/Borgendale/De Leo with the classification technique of Funk because using the payee of the check as a descriptive identifier for each processed check adds utility

Art Unit: 3691

and efficiency to the accounting process (See at least Funk: column 2, lines 24-35).

11. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cahill/Borgendale/De Leo/Funk as applied to claim 22 above, and further in view of Funk.

Claim 23: Cahill/Borgendale/De Leo/Funk discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of Claim 22 above. Funk further discloses the limitation of *wherein processing of the check includes whether or not the check will be included with a statement associated with the check*. Funk, in at least Column 4, Lines 58-62, discloses the process of sorting checks to be submitted with a statement. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the check sorting method of Cahill/Borgendale/De Leo with the processing technique of Funk because processing a check based on its submission with an associated statement is an efficient method of ensuring the accuracy of the accounting process (See at least Funk: column 2, lines 24-35).

12. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cahill/Borgendale/De Leo as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Haas (4,088,982).

Claim 26: Cahill/Borgendale/De Leo discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of Claim 15 above. Cahill/Borgendale/De Leo does not disclose the limitation of *a feeder module coupled to the scanner module, the feeder module receiving the plurality of checks and feeding the plurality of checks seriatim to the scanner module*. However, Haas (Column 3, Lines 35-36) discloses "A feeder holds a stack of checks and feeds them

serially to an error-indicating character reader...". It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the check sorting method of Cahill/Borgendale/De Leo with the input technique of Haas because incorporating a feeder helps to automate the check sorting process and make it more efficient (See at least De Leo: column 2, lines 30-35).

13. Claims 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cahill/Borgendale/De Leo as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Milford (4,315,246).

Claim 27: Cahill/Borgendale/De Leo discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of Claim 15 above. Cahill/Borgendale/De Leo does not disclose the limitation of *wherein the scanner module is a magnetic ink character recognition scanner*. However, Milford (Column 1, Lines 7-15) discloses a character recognition system that employs magnetic ink character recognition. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the check sorting method cited in Cahill/Borgendale/De Leo with the character recognition technique as taught by Milford because the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately.

Claim 28: Cahill/Borgendale/De Leo discloses the limitations as shown in the rejection of Claim 15 above. Cahill/Borgendale/De Leo does not disclose the limitation of *wherein the scanner module is an optical character recognition scanner*. However, Milford (Column 1, Lines 7-15) discloses a character recognition system that employs optical character recognition. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

Art Unit: 3691

to combine the check sorting method cited in Cahill/Borgendale/De Leo with the character recognition technique as taught by Milford because the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately.

Conclusion

- 14. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event of a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Preston, whose telephone number is (571) 270-3918. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

/John O Preston/

Examiner, Art Unit 3691

5-29-2008

/Alexander Kalinowski/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3691